

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

SEAN L. HARTFIELD,

No. 3:16-cv-00068-ST

Plaintiff,

v.

OREGON STATE BAR, and Unknown
Individuals (J. Does Nos. 1-10),

ORDER

Defendants.

HERNANDEZ, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge Stewart issued a Findings & Recommendation (#5) on January 15, 2016, in which she recommends the Court dismiss this action with prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Plaintiff has timely filed objections to the Findings & Recommendation. The matter is now before me pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b).

When any party objects to any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Findings & Recommendation, the district court must make a *de novo* determination of that portion of the

Magistrate Judge's report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Dawson v. Marshall, 561 F.3d 930, 932 (9th Cir. 2009); United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc).


I have carefully considered Plaintiff's objections and conclude there is no basis to modify the Findings & Recommendation. I have also reviewed the pertinent portions of the record *de novo* and find no other errors in the Magistrate Judge's Findings & Recommendation.

CONCLUSION

The Court ADOPTS Magistrate Judge Stewart's Findings & Recommendation [5], and therefore, this action is dismissed with prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 14 day of February, 2016.


MARCO A. HERNANDEZ
United States District Judge